

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Parint and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virguin 22313-1450

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/759,639	01/16/2004	Ayedin Nikazm	16356.834 (DC-05396) 1548	
27683	7590 10/05/2006		EXAMINER	
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP 901 MAIN STREET, SUITE 3100			ELAMIN, ABDELMONIEM I	
DALLAS, T			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ŕ			2116	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/759,639	NIKAZM ET AL.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Abdelmoniem Elamin	2116		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app r Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 Ju This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Dispositi	on of Claims				
 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Applicati	on Papers				
10)□	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1.	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)		
2) Notice (3) Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te		

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibasaki et al, US. Pat. No. 5,270,946 (previously cited) in view of Andrieu, US. Pat. No 5,336,568
- 3. Claims 1, 13, 24, Shibasaki teaches an information handling system (IHS) [computer system 1 of Fig. 1] comprising:
- a system board including a processor [inherently, computer systems comprise a system board including a processor];
 - a first battery for supplying power to the system board [battery 17 of Fig. 1];
 - a second battery for supplying power to the system board [battery 18 of Fig. 1]; and
- a switching circuit coupled to the first battery, the second battery and the system board [selecting circuit 19 of Fig. 1], for switching between the first battery and the second battery for supplying power to the system board.

Shibasaki fails to teach switching circuit for repeatedly switching between the first battery and the second battery, each battery supplying a peak amount of current for periods of time during which the switching circuit has connected one of the batteries for supplying current, while, simultaneously, the other of the batteries supplies no current whereby, in the aggregate, the batteries maintain a continuous supply of beak current to the system.

Andrieu teaches a battery select circuitry for repeatedly switching between a first battery and a second battery at predetermined time [abstract, col. 2, line 30 thru col. 3, line 10], wherein each battery supplying a peak amount of current for periods of time during which the switching circuit has connected one of the batteries for supplying current, while, simultaneously, the other of the batteries supplies no current whereby, in the aggregate, the batteries maintain a continuous supply of beak current to the system [e.g., only battery cell 20 supplies current during the intervals t3 and t7, see Fig. 3 and related disclosure].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Shibasaki to have the switching circuit for repeatedly switching between the first battery and the second battery, because it improves the length of life of the batteries [see Andrieu, title, col. 6, lines 33-34].

- 4. Claims 2, 14, Shibasaki teaches the switching circuit connects the first battery to supply power to the system board during first periods of time alternating with second periods of time during which the switching circuit connects the second battery to supply power to the system board [abstract, see also selecting circuit 19 of Fig. 1].
- 5. Claims 3, 15, Shibasaki teaches the peak power that can be drawn from the first battery during the first time periods is greater than the power that the first battery is capable supplying under a continuous load [because using the battery to power the load all the time wears it out].
- 6. Claims 4, 16, Shibasaki teaches the peak power that can be drawn from the second battery during the second time periods is greater than the power that the second battery is capable

Application/Control Number: 10/759,639

Art Unit: 2116

of supplying under a continuous load [because using the battery to power the load all the time wears it out].

7. Claims 5, 17, Shibasaki fails to teach the first time periods are equal in duration to the second time periods.

Andrieu teaches the first time periods are equal in duration to the second time periods [see Fig. 3].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Shibasaki to have the first time periods are equal in duration to the second time periods, because it increases the life of the batteries and wears out the two batteries at the same rate.

8. Claims 6-7, 18-19, both Shibasaki and Andrieu fail to teach the first time periods are greater/shorter in duration than the second time periods.

This is an obvious matter of design choice. Therefore, a worker in the art would be motivated to have the first time periods being greater (or shorter) in duration than the second time periods, because it provides the user of the IHS with more flexibility.

9. Claims 8, 20, Shibasaki fails to teach the switching circuit includes a field effect transistor (FET) switch.

Andrieu teaches the switching circuit includes a field effect transistor (FET) switch [see col. 5, lines 36-41].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Shibasaki to include field effect transistor (FET) switch, because of it high speed switching.

- 10. Claims 9, 21, Shibasaki teaches the switch operates in response to a switching signal generator [element 13 of Fig. I].
- 11. Claims 10, 22, Andrieu teaches the switching signal generator exhibits a variable switching frequency [at predetermined time periods].
- 12. Claims 11, 23, Shibasaki teaches a capacitor coupled to the switching circuit, wherein the capacitor is for stabilizing the voltage supplied to the system board [inherently, capacitors are used to stabilize voltage and eliminate oscillations].
- 13. Claims 12, Shibasaki teaches the IHS is a portable HIS [laptop, see col. 1, line 19].

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2116

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Abdelmoniem Elamin whose telephone number is 571-2727-

3674. The examiner can normally be reached on MON - THUR 10:00 AM - 6::00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Lynne Browne can be reached on 571-272-3670. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Abdelmoniem Elamin-Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2116

September 24, 2006